DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 084 PS 025 192

Stoneburner, Chris; Real, Mark AUTHOR

Child Care: Children Learning, Families Earning. TITLE

Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, Columbus. INSTITUTION

Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Joyce Foundation, SPONS AGENCY

Chicago, IL.

REPORT NO ISBN-1-881985-12-1

97 PUB DATE NOTE 47p.

Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, 52 East Lynn Street, Suite AVAILABLE FROM

> 400, Columbus, OH 43215-3508; phone: 614-221-2244; fax: 614-221-2247; e-mail: CDFOHIO[at sign]infinet.com (\$5, plus

shipping).

Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Information Analyses (070) PUB TYPE

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

Children; *Day Care; Disadvantaged Youth; Early Childhood DESCRIPTORS

> Education; Economically Disadvantaged; Family Needs; *Family Programs; Financial Support; Low Income Groups; Poverty; Program Improvement; *State Action; State Aid; Welfare

Recipients; *Welfare Services

Child Care Costs; Child Care Needs; *Ohio; *Welfare Reform IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

This guide is second in a series that provides basic information about programs affecting Ohio's children; it provides a summary of key data on child care in Ohio, especially with regard to recent welfare reform. Recommendations for improvement in child care services are given in the following areas: (1) "Children Learning," including encouraging more part-day programs and establishing a Child Care Improvement Fund; (2) "Parents Earning," including guaranteeing child care for welfare families who are working and making child care affordable for working poor families; (3) "Helping Families Work," including maintaining health and safety inspections of child care settings and continuing resource and referral services; (4) "Improving What Works," such as adjusting child care market rates, simplifying paperwork, and establishing a fair share for parent fees; and (5) "Managing Child Care Funding," including identifying an enrollment ceiling for each county, permitting counties to keep savings from reduced welfare rolls to help working poor families, and developing waiting lists for child care aid so the poorest families can be enrolled first. Appendices include a glossary of terms, staff to child ratios in Ohio early childhood programs, and child care assistance by county. Contains 22 references. (WJC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

from the original document.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CHILDREN LEARNING

CHILD CARE

FAMILIES EARNING

PS 025192

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark Real

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

DEAL LORD BE GOOD TOME THE SEATS SO WIDE AND MYBOATISOD SO SMALL DO

Children's Defense Fund Ohio

Decisions for Ohio Children

The world is changing for one in every eight Ohio children—and for their families. A new federal welfare law, effective on October 1, 1996, requires poor parents to work in exchange for temporary assistance. The new law eliminates the 60-year-old guarantee of cash assistance through the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program. The new block grant—Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)—provides Ohio with nearly \$100 million in additional funds this year.

In addition, the new Child Care and Development Block Grant combines four federal child care programs and increases funds modestly. These funds can be used for TANF families who work and for low-wage working families not receiving public assistance.

Decisions about how to use these funds are left largely to states. In Ohio, many of these decisions will be made during the first half of 1997, as the state's leaders develop the 1998-99 state budget. More state flexibility provides both challenges and opportunities for Ohio to address the child care needs of families receiving temporary assistance and for working poor families.

Child Care: Children Learning, Families Earning is the second in a series of guides that provide basic information about programs affecting Ohio's children. The first report explored state options for the Medicaid public health program. Future reports will cover the employment and benefit portions of TANF. Policy makers and community leaders can use these

guides as tools in their work to shape programs to help Ohio

families work.

There are two reasons why helping families work requires quality child care. First, children need safe and secure child care that helps them learn and prepare for school. Second, parents need stable, affordable child care so they can earn wages to support their families. Implementing the new welfare law gives Ohio the chance to address both needs.



CHILDREN LEARNING CHILD CHILD CHILD CHILD CHILD FAMILIES EARNING

Children's Defense Fund-Ohio 1997

Written by Chris Stoneburner and Mark Real



CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Children Learning	6
Parents Earning	10
Helping Families Work	15
Improving What Works	20
Child Care Funding	23
Appendices:	
Glossary of Terms	27
Staff to Child Ratios in	
Ohio Early Childhood Programs	29
Child Care Assistance by County	30
Sources	35



Special thanks to the KIDS COUNT project of The Annie E. Casey Foundation—and to The Joyce Foundation, The Nord Family Foundation, and The James Overstreet Fund of The Columbus Foundation—for support of work in the early childhood care and education arena.

Editorial and production assistance by VMC Consulting Group, Inc.

© 1997 by Children's Defense Fund All Rights Reserved Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 1-881985-12-1

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks to the following CDF staff for support in the preparation of this report: Robin Harris, Susan Jagers, Mary Wachtel, Susan Lewis, Eileen Cooper Reed, and Charles "Fritz" Casey-Leininger.



INTRODUCTION

The world *has* changed for the majority of Ohio's children as all parents—married and single—are now working in record numbers. Every day, more than 240,000 Ohio youngsters are cared for in child care centers. During the school year, 217,000 young children attend part-day programs such as Head Start and kindergarten. Yet few of these part-day programs meet the needs of working parents.

For one in eight of Ohio's children who rely on public assistance, the world today *is* changing dramatically. As a consequence of the new federal welfare law, more parents will be required to work. Parents of one- and two-year-olds, as well as parents of older children, will be participating in activities focused on gaining private sector employment.

Struggling working poor families face the biggest challenge of all. The full cost of child care—which can reach as high as 30 percent of pre-tax wages for a parent with only one child—is beyond their means. Yet these families are least likely of all income groups to have access to early care and education programs. Help with child care costs can mean the difference between a pay check and a welfare check. Often the lack of child care assistance means a patchwork of unreliable, poor quality care that does not help children learn and causes parents to miss work.

Ohio has made a significant commitment, more than any other state, to improve school readiness for three- and four-year-olds through expansion of the Head Start program for poor children. Yet, many poor children, including infants, toddlers, and those just above the official poverty line, fall through the cracks for that first and important chance at educational opportunity.

Child care is a fact of life for today's families. For all children, but especially for poor children, the stability and quality of these early settings is critical to school achievement. National studies, and even an Ohio study of 14,290 children, reveal that early childhood programs do improve educational achievement and have lasting benefits. However, the national studies also find the quality of both center and home-based child care settings is uneven.

Child Care: Children Learning, Families Earning provides a summary of key data and information about child care in Ohio. It takes a fresh look at Ohio's system of and investment in early care and education. Today, Ohio has an opportunity to take a bold step forward, once again leading the nation, by addressing the dual goals of education and welfare reform at the same time.

Today, Ohio has an opportunity to take a bold step forward...by addressing the dual goals of education and welfare reform at the same time.



Ohio can improve child care settings and help more parents work by:

Children Learning

- encouraging more part-day programs to meet the full-day needs of working parents:
- establishing a Child Care Improvement Fund to increase child care quality in centers and homes serving substantial numbers of poor children;

Parents Earning

- guaranteeing child care for welfare families who are working and those learning job skills, and for former welfare families who work for one year;
- helping make child care affordable for struggling working poor families;

Helping Families Work

 maintaining health and safety inspections of child care settings and continuing child care resource and referral to help families find care and increase the supply of providers;

Improving What Works

- adjusting child care market rates to ensure that poor families have a reasonable choice of providers, simplifying contract and voucher systems to reduce paperwork;
- establishing a fair share for parent fees based on income and improving parents' access to reports on child care programs;

Managing Child Care Funding

- establishing predictability and helping local planning efforts by identifying an enrollment ceiling for each county;
- permitting counties with reduced welfare rolls to keep part of the savings and help more working poor families with child care aid; and
- establishing a pilot program to develop waiting lists for child care aid so the poorest families can be enrolled first.

As a state concerned about the workforce of the 21st century, Ohio cannot afford to miss early childhood care and education opportunities to help prepare the next generation of productive adults. Likewise, keeping struggling parents in the workforce through child care aid gives children firsthand role models of parents as workers and contributors to their community. It makes sense for Ohio to help children learn and help families earn.



CHANGING TIMES

The new federal welfare block grant—Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)—shifts the focus of state and federal welfare services from providing cash assistance to all poor families who qualify, to moving more families into work.

TANF benefits are time-limited. More parents will be required to participate in work activities each year. Yet, under the new federal welfare law, families working to leave welfare will only be "entitled" to child care if the state decides to cover them. In the near-term, Ohio will receive more federal dollars under both TANF and the Child Care Block Grant than it would have received under the old programs. However, as more parents—including those with younger children—are required to work, the Congressional Budget Office projects federal funding for child care will not keep pace with demand.

Two key provisions of new federal welfare law make child care the linchpin for successful welfare reform. First, parents receiving TANF assistance now face a five-year lifetime limit of help. Current Ohio law restricts eligibility to three years in a five year period. Second, parents with children age one or two are no longer exempt from work requirements. Ohio's new welfare plan should estimate how many additional adults will need to find jobs each year, and how much child care will be needed. Local communities should do the same.

It is critical that parents quickly gain the skills and experience they need to hold a job. This means that job placement services and child care must be available sooner rather than later. Parents should not wait to begin their job experience until eligibility for cash assistance is about to be depleted. Being able to return to assistance during times of economic downturns, when many jobs are eliminated, will not be possible if the time limit on benefits is exhausted. Experience shows that many of these workers will face several job changes as they move to more stable employment. Parents also may need education or training to help them be successful in holding a job.

Ohio faces federal financial penalties, which could cost the state \$6 million a month, if we fail to meet the increasing work participation rates for families receiving help. Beginning in October 1997, 30 percent of single parent families receiving assistance must be working or participating in work activity for 20 hours a week. This increases to 50 percent of single parents working 30 hours a week by 2002.



CHILDREN LEARNING

The early childhood years present a special opportunity to open a door to a child's future. Intervening early in the lives of children—particularly for those who are economically disadvantaged—is widely believed to provide the best opportunity to forestall later problems, and to ready children for school and for life.

This is why it is so important that children receive high quality care and education in all early childhood settings. Yet recent national studies indicate that quality varies widely in child care centers and family day care homes.

Ohio has a unique opportunity to raise student achievement by improving child care settings, and meet education and welfare reform goals at the same time. The challenge is to improve the quality of care and education of young children while structuring programs to help parents work.

Care and Education of Young Ohio Children

In September 1996, families of more than 59,000 poor young Ohio children received child care assistance. Almost one-third of these children were infants and toddlers, while another third were preschool children. More than one-third were young school age children, including 5-year-olds who spend part of their day in kindergarten classes.

Parents can choose child care settings ranging from care provided by a relative, in a certified family day care home, or in a licensed center or large home. A licensed center can be not-for-profit, for-profit, sponsored by a religious organization or employer based. Centers may be part of a national chain, operated by private proprietors, or be developed by community organizations or schools.

In addition, approximately 72,000 Ohio preschoolers attend either Head Start, Public Preschool, or Preschool Special Education programs mostly in part-day settings. Another 145,000 children attend public school kindergarten, usually for 2.5 hours a day. Many of these children spend part of their day in another child care setting because approximately 60 percent of Ohio mothers with children under age six are employed. Coupled with the new welfare work requirements, even more young children will need care beyond the part-time schedule of these programs.

Some part-day programs help meet the full-day care needs of working parents by transporting children to other fullday programs. Others extend their hours for a portion of the

The early childhood years present a special opportunity to open a door to a child's future. Intervening early in the lives of childrenparticularly those who are economically disadvantagedis widely believed to provide the best opportunity to forestall later problems, and to ready children for school and for life.



children. Part-day programs, however, often provide more educational services. such as field trips or special services for children with disabilities, and health and parent training activities. But many working families cannot take advantage of these special services because they need full-day care.

Child Care Helps Children Learn, But More Help Is Needed

Children learn best when settings are safe and comfortable, caregivers are trained, staff to child ratios are small, children have the same teachers every day, and toys and other materials are age appropriate. Stimulating, caring environments promote learning, whether at home with parents and caregivers or in group settings with other adults. However, recent national studies identify vast quality differences in both center and homebased child care settings.

Two recent reports from the Carnegie Corporation highlight the importance of the early years in promoting learning. Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children shows that stimulating early experiences for infants and toddlers result in better learners. In fact, early brain development is more vulnerable to the environment and long lasting than previously suspected. Good experiences with parents and caregivers in the first three years of life foster cognitive development, which is associated with later academic achievement, work performance, and getting along with others.

Years of Promise: A Comprehensive Learning Strategy for America's Children summarizes decades of research on preschool programs, concluding that high quality programs prepare children for school and have long lasting benefits. Consequently, members of the Carnegie Task Force on Learning in the Primary Grades recommend expanding a mix of high-quality public and private early childhood programs as one way to reverse a pattern of underachievement in the nation's schools.

In 1992, the Ohio Department of Education released the results of a longitudinal study on the effects of early child-hood program attendance and varying kindergarten schedules on the success of 14,290 Ohio children in kindergarten and early elementary grades. Compared to children with no early child-hood program experience the year before kindergarten, children who attended a child care program, Head Start, or preschool were:

 much less likely to be placed in a Chapter 1 remedial program; Good experiences with parents and caregivers in the first three years of life foster cognitive development, which is associated with later academic achievement, work performance, and getting along with others.



- much less likely to repeat an elementary grade; and
- more likely to post higher scores on standardized tests—lasting well into the third grade.

The lesson is clear: starting early pays off. Participation in pre-kindergarten programs results in cost savings in early elementary grades and produces educational benefits for children.

The same study also found that standardized test results favoring full-day kindergarten over half-day or alternate day kindergarten were gone by the end of the second grade, compared to benefits lasting well into third grade for children attending early childhood programs. Therefore, a full day of kindergarten in public schools, usually only six hours, may not be the most cost effective way to improve learning or help families work.

One way to help more parents work and improve learning is to take the educational component and/or additional services of Head Start, preschool, or kindergarten to the child care setting. This one-stop shop for young children simplifies life for working parents because siblings can be cared for in the same location. Busing of preschool and kindergarten children from child care to part-day programs and back to child care is eliminated. Building costs are reduced when services are combined.

In recent years, Ohio has become the nation's leader in expanding Head Start. Now it can be a national leader in improving learning in child care settings for poor children. Ohio can encourage local part-day programs to meet full-day needs of working parents by:

- providing incentives for public schools to outstation kindergarten teachers in child care centers;
- targeting Head Start expansion in child care settings; and
- helping part-day programs extend the day based on more cost effective child care staffing patterns.

Establishing a Child Care Improvement Fund is another option for upgrading educational programming in child care settings. An improvement fund managed jointly by the Departments of Education and Human Services can provide grants to meet national accreditation standards, train staff, re-

In recent years,
Ohio has become
the nation's leader
in expanding Head
Start. Now there is
a chance to be a
national leader in
improving learning
in child care
settings for poor
children.



duce staff turnover, add more staff for a portion of the day, upgrade equipment and materials, or provide specialized services. By targeting child care programs and homes serving substantial numbers of poor children—those who face the highest risk of educational failure—Ohio can improve school readiness and school success.

Child care centers and family day care networks could directly apply or jointly apply through a child care resource and referral agency. Priority should go to programs serving the highest percent of children under 150 percent of poverty (\$7.47 per hour for a parent and one child). Unlike hospitals and public schools serving high rates of low-income children, child care programs do not receive a higher rate for poor children. In fact, in many cases the child care assistance rate is lower for poor children than for families who pay the full rate. A Child Care Improvement Fund can help address the more intense needs of poor children in rural and inner city areas.

RECOMMENDATION #1

Encourage more part-day programs to meet full-day needs of working parents, including placing kindergarten teachers in child care centers.

RECOMMENDATION #2

Establish a Child Care Improvement Fund to increase the quality of child care in centers and homes serving substantial numbers of poor children at-risk of educational failure.

Children Learning



PARENTS EARNING

Moving from welfare to work, or avoiding welfare in the first place, requires child care for families with young children. Yet the full cost of care—\$73 a week, on average, for one preschool child—is beyond the means of poor families.

Three groups of poor Ohio working families need help paying for child care. These three groups include working families receiving cash assistance, those transitioning off welfare, and low-wage families not on assistance. Reliable, affordable child care helps these parents work and helps prepare their youngsters for school.

Welfare Reform

Welfare rolls in Ohio have declined for the past four years. Due to a robust economy and efforts by county departments of human services, more poor families are working in Ohio today. Since 1992, welfare rolls have decreased by almost one-third. As a result of decreasing rolls, Ohio spent about \$713 million in fiscal year 1996 on cash assistance, compared to nearly \$953 million in fiscal year 1992.

Moving from welfare to work requires child care assistance. As of December 1996, more than 57,000 Ohio children age one and two, and nearly 83,000 children age three through five, lived in families receiving cash assistance. Another 132,000 children age six through 12 depended on public assistance. Child care aid will be critical for many of these children, particularly those under age 10, if their parents are to work or participate in education or training activities to prepare for work.

In 1988, then President Ronald Reagan recognized this need and signed a law making child care an entitlement for welfare families who worked or attended education and training programs. But today, under the new federal welfare law, families are no longer entitled to child care help. However, Ohio can continue this guarantee.

In order to meet the work participation rates of the new law—avoiding a penalty that could cost our state up to \$6 million a month—and to ensure welfare parents an opportunity to gain job skills, Ohio should guarantee child care for participating welfare families. Because of the shrinking welfare rolls and provisions of the new law, Ohio will receive nearly \$100 million more in federal welfare funds this year than would have been received under the old law. Ohio can use a portion of these funds to guarantee child care assistance for working welfare families and those in training activities.

The new welfare program has a time limit, requires parents to cooperate with child support, requires work, and contains tough penalties for missed appointments.





Additionally, the new welfare program has a time limit, requires parents to cooperate with child support, requires work, and contains tough penalties for missed appointments. Consequently, a child care guarantee for families who play by these rules is a fair and reasonable state commitment to helping families work.

Many Ohio families leaving welfare for jobs remain poor. In fact, an analysis of September 1996 child care aid for families who left welfare to work reveals that 63 percent of children lived in families where earnings did not exceed the federal poverty level (\$6.24 per hour for a parent with two children). Only five percent of children lived in families earning between \$9.37 and \$11.54 per hour. Ohio should continue a guarantee of one year of transitional child care aid for these families.

Ohio's Working, But Poor Families

In Years of Promise: A Comprehensive Learning Strategy for America's Children, the Carnegie Corporation reveals that while children in families living at or below the federal poverty level may have access to Head Start and child care subsidies, struggling working poor families have the least chance of all income groups to early care and education programs. Working poor families cannot afford the full cost of child care and education programs, and have limited options for child care assistance.

Ironically, this is also true in Ohio, where—thanks to the state expansion of Head Start—children living in poverty have the same chance to attend a preschool program as do children from upper-income families. Nationally, 38 percent of children eligible for Head Start attend. In Ohio, 75 percent of eligible three- and four-year-olds are enrolled.

In 1990, sixty percent of Ohio mothers with children under age six worked, compared to only 10 percent in 1950. However, nearly 22 percent of Ohio children are poor, even though half of their families have a working family member. Even with the increase in minimum wage to \$4.75 per hour (\$9,880 a year), a full-time working parent with one child remains below the federal poverty level. Approximately 30 percent of U.S. workers earn less than poverty level wages, or \$6.24 per hour for a family of three.

For low-wage working parents, help with child care costs can mean the difference between a pay check and a welfare check. More often it means the difference between a child care setting that is safe and helps children learn or a patchwork

The Carnegie
Corporation reveals
that while children
in families living at
or below the federal
poverty level may
have access to Head
Start and child care
subsidies, struggling
working poor
families have the
least chance of all
income groups to
early care and
education programs.

of unreliable, lower cost options. A study of families waiting for child care help in Minneapolis found that 24 percent turned to welfare during the 18-month period of the study. Almost 75 percent fell into debt. Their child care arrangements also changed more frequently than those who received help. Changing arrangements often is detrimental to learning because young children need stable relationships in order to learn. Parents are likely to miss work when arrangements fall through, putting job security at risk.

The Economics of Child Care

The full cost of child care is beyond the means of working poor families. In 1995, the average cost of care for a four-year-old in an Ohio child care center was \$73 per week. Infant care often exceeds \$90 per week. Care in family day care homes registered with child care resource and referral agencies is similar in cost.

What does this mean for working poor families? It means that a single parent earning \$6.24 per hour—or just less than \$13,000 per year—would spend nearly 30 percent of pre-tax income on child care *for one preschool aged child*. It explains why, in 1990, the nation's poorest families spent 25 percent of income on child care, while upper-income families spent only six percent of income on care.

Making early childhood care and education affordable is one part of the mission of the Early Childhood Committee of Ohio Family and Children First Initiative. The family budgets on page 13 clearly demonstrate that child care is not affordable for working poor Ohio families without help. Working families just above poverty are often worse off financially because they lose other supports such as health care and food stamps. In order to meet this goal—making child care affordable—Ohio should continue a child care assistance program for struggling working families.

Parents Earning

RECOMMENDATION #3

Guarantee child care for welfare families who are working and those learning job skills, and for former welfare families during their first year of employment.

RECOMMENDATION #4

Help make child care affordable for struggling working poor families. Help families earning up to 135 percent of poverty (\$6.72 per hour for a parent and one child). Allow families to continue until income exceeds 150 percent of poverty (\$7.47 per hour for a family of two) so that children's learning is not interrupted.





The Cost of Raising Two Children in a Family of Three BASED ON 1996 POVERTY LEVEL

1	00% of Poverty	135% of Poverty	150% of Poverty
HOURLY WAGE	\$ 6.24	\$ 8.42	\$ 9.36
MONTHLY WAGES	\$ 1,082	\$ 1,460	\$ 1,623
ANNUAL INCOME	\$12,980	\$17,523	\$19,470
Monthly Net Income	\$ 964	\$ 1,244	\$ 1,359
Food Stamps	315	0	0
EITC	272	193	157
Monthly Resources	\$ 1,551	\$ 1,437	\$ 1,516
EXPENSES			
Rent/Utilities	\$ 406	\$ 406	\$ 406
Health Care	36	134	134
Food	367	367	367
Transportation	130	130	130
Necessities	228	228	228
Child Care	525	525	525
Monthly Expenditure	es \$ 1,692	\$ 1,790	\$ 1,790
Deficit	(\$ 141)	(\$ 353)	(\$ 274)

NOTE: Paying for child care in addition to other expenses, more than exhausts these family budgets. Many families have emergencies that are not reflected in this month.

MONTHLY NET INCOME adjusted for withholding for a single parent and two children. Reflects actual federal tax liability.

FOOD STAMPS reflects maximum amount for family at 100 percent of poverty. At 135 percent and 150 percent, families are no longer eligible.

Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a federal credit that can be refunded monthly or annually. Most families receive an annual refund, not monthly as reflected in the budget. As a result, monthly deficits would increase substantially. About 14 to 20 percent of eligible families do not file for the credit.

RENT/UTILITIES, FOOD, TRANSPORTATION, and NECESSITIES estimates are from Table 720 of the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1995; 1993 data adjusted for inflation to estimate 1996 amounts

HEALTH CARE for children at 100 percent of poverty is provided through Healthy Start (an eligibility category under Medicaid). The parent is not covered through Medicaid at any income level nor are the children at 135 percent and 150 percent of poverty. Average employee contribution for single coverage is estimated at \$36 per month and family coverage is estimated at \$134, based on U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Employee Benefits Surveys. This does not include deductibles or co-pays. In 1995, one of seven American children was uninsured for the full year and 90 percent of uninsured children have parents who work.

CHILD CARE costs of \$73/week for a preschool child in a center and \$42/week for a schoolage child during the school year. For 12 weeks, schoolage care is calculated at \$69 per week for full-day care. Average monthly cost for both children is \$525. Family day care costs are similar.



Ohio should continue a systematic process of increasing funding to help more struggling working poor families. Priority for openings should go first to families no longer eligible for guaranteed child care help so that children can continue in their early learning setting. New families should be enrolled based on income with the poorest families being served first.

Family Size	Annual	Monthly	Hourly
100% of Poverty			
2	\$10,360	\$ 863	\$ 4.98
3	\$12,980	\$1,082	\$ 6.24
135% of Poverty			
2	\$13,986	\$1,166	\$ 6.72
3	\$17,523	\$1,460	\$ 8.42
50% of Poverty			
2	\$15,540	\$1,295	\$ 7.47
3	\$19,470	\$1,623	\$ 9.36
85% of Poverty			
2	\$19,166	\$1,597	\$ 9.21
3	\$24,013	\$2,001	\$ 11.54

Hourly rate is based on full-time employment of 40 hours per week, 52 weeks per year. Federal minimum wage is currently \$4.75 per hour.

Effective September 1, 1997, federal minimum wage increases to \$5.15 per hour.





HELPING FAMILIES WORK

Recognizing the link between affordable child care and the ability of families—especially low-income families—to work, Ohio's leaders have have taken a number to steps in recent years to improve child care in Ohio. Today, the safety of children in child care settings is a primary concern and supported through surprise inspections of licensed centers and certified family day care homes. Tax credits and child care aid help families purchase child care. Local child care resource and referral services help all families locate child care to meet their needs.

Child Care in Ohio: A Progress Report

Few Ohioans over age 25 ever spent much time as children in a child care center. Over the last 30 to 40 years, however, changes in family life and family economics have altered that reality for today's generation of youngsters. Taken together, these changes have greatly expanded the demand for child care—a demand that has been felt by families of all income levels. These changes have created tremendous opportunity for action in the child care arena.

State licensed child care centers. Today, Ohio families can choose from a growing number of state licensed child care centers. Since 1984, the number of centers licensed by the Ohio Department of Human Services has grown by approximately 70 percent, with more than 3,700 centers now licensed. These centers enroll more than 242,000 young Ohio children. Child care aid helped more than 38,000 children from low-income families attend a center program in September 1996.

Centers must meet basic standards for health and safety of children. Centers are inspected twice annually with one of these visits being a surprise inspection. Inspectors look for things such as adequate adult supervision of children, safe and appropriate toys and equipment, and practices that protect the health and safety of children.

In addition, since 1992, the Ohio Department of Education has licensed preschool programs operated by schools. Most are part-day programs. Currently, 1,334 programs are licensed by the Department, which also includes licensed before and after school programs.

Certified home providers. County departments of human services certify home providers to care for up to six children whose care is paid for in part through public funds. Certification insures that homes are safe and background checks

Since 1984, the number of centers licensed by the Ohio Department of Human Services has grown by approximately 70 percent.



Driven primarily
by matching
requirements in
order to receive the
federal funds.
Ohio increased
state spending
from \$14.8 million
in 1991 to an
estimated \$83.7
million in 1997.

are completed on providers. Inspections help to make sure that care is appropriate and a safe environment is maintained. Certified home providers cared for approximately one-third of poor children in families receiving child care aid, nearly 21,000 children in September 1996.

Certified home care is particularly important for Ohio's youngest children. Only five percent of licensed spaces in centers were reserved for infants and approximately 12 percent were available for toddlers. More than one-quarter of Ohio counties have severe shortages of infant placements in centers. In September 1996, 15 counties served 10 or fewer babies and 10 counties had no center that accepted infants. It is important to continue to monitor home providers to protect the health and safety of poor children, often the youngest and most vulnerable, while also improving quality.

Child care tax credit. In 1986, Ohio instituted a child care tax credit, for families with incomes up to \$40,000. In Tax Year 1993, nearly \$7 million in Ohio child care tax credits offset a portion of the taxes owed by nearly 61,000 families.

Combined state and federal child care tax credits help moderate income families pay up to one-third of work related child care costs. Unlike the federal Earned Income Tax Credit, the child care credit is not refundable. Therefore, working families too poor to pay taxes do not benefit from child care tax credits.

State and federal funding. Since 1974, Ohio has provided direct child care aid through federal funding and more recently through additional state funding. Over the past eight years, four new federal child care programs greatly expanded child care resources. Driven primarily by matching requirements in order to receive the federal funds. Ohio increased state spending from \$14.8 million in 1991 to an estimated \$83.7 million in 1997. However, federal funds provide two out of three child care dollars. As a result, total spending in Ohio increased from \$20.3 million in 1984 to an estimated \$209 million in 1997.

Using a small portion of its federal funds. Ohio established a statewide network of child care resource and referral (CCR&R) programs operated by local non-profit agencies. All Ohio families can turn to these programs for help in locating child care. Community based CCR&R agencies maintain a data base of centers and homes. By calling the local program, a parent can get information about all types of care and education providers near their home or work site, as well as information about what to look for in choosing quality child care.



CCR&R agencies recruit and train providers, work with local employers on child care issues, and maintain data on supply and demand for child care. Based on community needs, local agencies work to improve quality and expand the supply of child care.

In 1995, Ohio child care resource and referral programs:

- helped 34,753 families locate child care, 26 percent earned below poverty level wages;
- listed 3,979 care and education programs in data bases;
- listed 7,248 homes in data bases;
- provided 917 training opportunities for providers;
- helped establish 1,865 new home-based programs;
- helped establish 309 new center based programs; and
- helped establish 176 new schoolage programs.

Moving Forward. The new federal Child Care Block Grant, which became law in August 1996, consolidates four federal child care programs. Because of this consolidation, some states are struggling to combine child care services with different fees schedules. provider payment rates, and eligibility rules under one state agency.

Ohio, on the other hand, is well positioned to move forward since the Governor and Legislature coordinated all federal child care funding under one state agency and developed a combined program application process in 1991. Ohio was one of the first states and a national model in the development of a system where families were not forced to change providers when their eligibility shifted from one federal child care program to another. Likewise, local providers were paid the same rate regardless of federal funding stream.

Child Care Aid in Ohio

Today, after a concerted effort, the Ohio Department of Human Services is able to provide accurate and timely information on the status of child care aid in Ohio. In fact, Ohio is far ahead of most other states in its ability to meet the new federal reporting requirements of the Child Care Block Grant.

Ohio is well positioned to move forward since the Governor and Legislature coordinated all federal child care funding under one state agency and developed a combined program application process in 1991.



Incomes of Ohio's Working Families Receiving Child Care Assistance, September 1996

-	ransitio 83 chi		Family Earnings (family size of 3)	Working But Poor 27,431 children
_	53%	up to	\$6.24 hr (100% poverty	50%
2	27%	to S	88.43 hr (135% poverty)	28%
	5%	to S	\$9.36 hr (150% poverty)	7%
	5%	to \$	11.54 hr (185% poverty)	5%

SOURCE: ODHS Report NMR120RA, 9/1/96 to 9/30/96 CALCULATIONS: CDF-Ohio

Monthly, county-by-county data are available on the number of children, family income, age of child, child care setting, average cost of care, and total expenditures. Changes can even be monitored on a daily basis as county departments of

human services add or remove children from the program.

The data for September 1996 provide a snapshot of children and families receiving child care assistance:

- 27,431 children lived in working but poor families.
- 19,955 children were enrolled because their parents participated in the JOBS or LEAP program for ADC families.
- 8,583 children lived in families who left welfare within the past 12 months and are currently employed.
- 3,353 children were enrolled for other reasons including protection from abuse or neglect.
- families contributed nearly \$853,000 toward the cost of care in September.
- the average cost to Ohio was \$274 per child (based on September 1996 reports).
- 4 of 5 families using child care aid have only one child enrolled.

County departments of human services determine family eligibility for child care aid and help families locate child care providers. Counties determine the parent fee, certify and

21





monitor home providers, and contract with centers. In addition, they manage child care funding and process billings and payments to home providers and centers. A few counties contract some of these responsibilities to local agencies.

Because of limited funds, many counties had to reduce eligibility for child care aid for working poor families. In fact, as of December 1996, 29 counties had closed enrollment for working poor families. A county-by-county listing is in the appendix to this report.

Helping Families Work

RECOMMENDATION #5

Continue Ohio's commitment to child safety by regularly inspecting child care centers and homes.

RECOMMENDATION #6

Continue to support Ohio's statewide network of community-based child care resource and referral services.



The number of providers able to enroll poor children will shrink if rates are inadequate. In fact, centers established to help poor families such as those located in YMCAs and YWCAs. settlement houses. and religious settings—could be forced to reduce services, even though demand is likely to increase dramatically with the implementation of TANF.

IMPROVING WHAT WORKS

Since 1988, increased child care assistance has allowed thousands of Ohio children to receive safe, affordable care. During this same period, federal initiatives helped expand the number of providers who care for poor children, promote parent choice and improve quality. The new federal Child Care Block Grant, with its greater state flexibility, provides opportunities for Ohio to keep the "best practices" of the earlier programs—and to make improvements.

Market Rates Affect Parent Choice

One of the practices that has increased the number of centers serving poor children, just as it has expanded parent choice, is the establishment of market rates for child care. Under this procedure, states were required to survey the child care market and establish payment rates for centers, based on the amount charged to families who did not receive child care assistance. While a statewide ceiling on rates did not allow poor families the full range of highest cost services, parent choice was greatly expanded. In 1984, approximately 186 Ohio centers enrolled poor children. By 1992, more than 950 centers provided care for families who received aid.

Parent choice, expanded by the market rate system, is now in jeopardy in Ohio. New rates should have been established early in 1996. Yet, payment rates have not been revised since January 1994, based on a market rate survey conducted early in 1993. Even though a survey was completed and new market rates drafted, the Ohio Department of Human Services has not adjusted rates.

Revised rates will mean that fewer children will be served, unless overall funding is increased. Yet, the number of providers able to enroll poor children will shrink if rates are inadequate. In fact, centers established to help poor families—such as those located in YMCAs and YWCAs, settlement houses, and religious settings—could be forced to reduce services, even though demand is likely to increase dramatically with the implementation of TANF.

The opponents to updating market rates fear it will permit some providers to increase rates artificially. Yet, since public dollars help purchase less than 20 percent of spaces in licensed centers, it is unlikely that the larger child care market will be influenced. Fair market rates are important in ensuring poor parents a choice of child care setting and keeping open those centers that serve a higher percentage of children from low-income families.



Simplified Paperwork

In recent years, federal law also contributed to the introduction of child care vouchers or certificates. In theory, eligible families could receive a certificate to be used at any facility or home that met state standards and did not exceed the market rate. While contracts with providers were not required in federal law when certificates were used. Ohio has continued with a system of contracts that appears to be burdensome and labor intensive for both county human services departments and providers.

Currently, Ohio counties have flexibility in the design of certificates and contract forms, as long as some standard elements are included. But providers serving multiple counties face increased costs as they manage different sets of paper work.

Continued work is needed to streamline the certificate and contract systems. Ohio should reduce paperwork for centers, which would help encourage more employers to provide child care. In this regard, the State of Ohio could learn from its own child support system, which has uniform paperwork for employers serving several counties.

Child Care Profile: The Longaberger® Company

With 4,500 workers. The Longaberger Company is the largest employer in Muskingum County. To help meet its employees' child care needs, the Company established The Longaberger Family Center, $^{\text{TM}}$ a state-of-the-art child care center in 1995.

Presently, The Family Center is open 24 hours a day, five days a week, and serves 150 youngsters ranging from infants to 12-year-olds. It provides care to 10 or 12 children whose families are eligible for child care assistance. And its rates are very affordable: \$75 a week for infant care, and \$60 a week for preschool care.

The Company underwrites additional costs, and the Center exceeds state licensing standards by providing two adults for eight infants and two adults for 10 toddlers.

About eight percent of the children are from families who receive child care assistance. Because employees come from 20 counties, the Center deals with several county departments of human services at any given time. Unfortunately, this means the Center has to spend additional time completing different paperwork for each county. It also has to maintain different attendance requirements for specific counties.

Parents' Fair Share

Currently, all working parents receiving child care aid, except those relying on cash assistance, pay a portion of their child care costs. Under TANF, even welfare families may be required to pay a fee.



Parent fees have been adjusted several times over the past few years. Rates have shifted from a very modest level to a high of 25 percent of income. At 25 percent of income, many families had no choice but to leave the program seeking lower cost and often unstable arrangements. Currently some rates are nominal and most child care professionals agree that parent fees could be raised modestly. Fees should be based on a percentage of parents' income, not exceeding 10 percent.

Helping Parents Monitor Child Care Settings

Ohio's system of monitoring child care settings includes two inspections a year by trained workers. Inspection reports, which are public record, are completed for all inspections.

Improving What Works

RECOMMENDATION #7

Adjust child care center market rates to reflect the cost of doing business, and to ensure that parents have a reasonable choice of child care providers.

RECOMMENDATION #8

Simplify contract and voucher systems so providers and counties can reduce unnecessary paperwork.

RECOMMENDATION #9

Establish a fair share for parent fees not exceeding 10 percent of income.

RECOMMENDATION #10

Improve parents' access to reports on child care programs so they can monitor their child's program each day.

Parents can get copies of the reports and other information about the centers through the Ohio Department of Human Services, however this process can be lengthy. The State of Ohio can help parents become informed consumers and learn more about child care standards by making the information readily available at the child care site. Inspection reports should be posted along with other information, such as weekly menus. Centers should also post their plan for correcting any problems. This information will help parents monitor the program every day of the year, rather than depend solely on two annual visits by inspectors.





CHILD CARE FUNDING

During the past decade and a half, the management of child care funding has shifted from county human services departments to state control—and back to counties. No system to date has been without problems. Yet, with an improved statewide computer system now in place, Ohio is in a position to develop a more effective and efficient system of shared responsibility for managing child care funding.

Recent History

In the 1980s, counties received funding allocations and established local criteria for eligibility within very broad parameters. A family eligible in one county would not necessarily be eligible in the neighboring county. Little information was available at the state level about the families who received help. Some counties routinely over spent their allocation, while federal funds went unused in other counties. Still other counties reduced eligibility or closed enrollment as funds were depleted.

To jump start the expansion of child care services, and to avoid lapsing federal funds, Ohio established state management of child care funding in 1991. Broad statewide eligibility guidelines were followed by all counties to enroll families. For the first time, families had the same chance to get child care help regardless of where they lived. Poor families could receive care in the county where they lived or the county where they worked. Moving across a county line did not result in termination of child care help.

During the first half of the 1990s, Ohio law required the Ohio Department of Human Services and the Office of Budget and Management to monitor expenditures and to restrict or reduce statewide eligibility as needed. Yet delays and problems in implementing the child care computer system left the state dependent on expenditure information from counties. As long as six months lapsed between when child care was first provided to the time the state received and examined expenditure reports from counties.

The rapid increase in child care assistance as a result of pent-up demand, coupled with the lag time in reporting, caught state officials off-guard. As a result, the program for working poor families was closed to new applicants for two spans totaling 20 months between October 1992 and December 1994.

After a period of state-controlled child care funding, the 1996-1997 state budget shifted responsibility for establishing eligibility back to county departments of human services, With an improved statewide computer system now in place. Ohio is in a position to develop a more effective and efficient system of shared responsibility for managing child care funding.



within reduced statewide limits for working poor families. Counties were allocated funds for the working poor beginning in January 1996 and required to manage the program within their allotted resources.

However, as of December 1996, almost one-third of counties had closed enrollment for working poor families. In counties where enrollment has been frozen, working poor families who apply for child care aid receive no help. For working poor families, getting child care help depends on where you live. Only a few counties keep waiting lists, so most families cannot be contacted when services reopen.

Sharing Responsibility

Providing information on the number of children from working poor families a county can enroll is key to local planning efforts and establishes predictability in the child care system. Local policy makers and community leaders can work together to identify local resources to enroll additional children in working poor families. Likewise, local leaders need information on the number of parents who will be required to participate in TANF work activities. Ongoing estimates of the child care needed for this group will be important to ensure an adequate supply of child care providers.

To meet Ohio's welfare reform needs and to help families as they leave welfare to work, the State of Ohio should guarantee child care for these groups. Child care for families receiving cash assistance can be paid for from the welfare block grant, reserving most of the Child Care Block Grant funds for working poor families.

With a new state investment and a portion of Child Care Block Grant funds, counties could receive an enrollment ceiling for children from working poor families. Enrolling working families with incomes ranging up to 135 percent of poverty (\$6.72 per hour for a parent with one child) and allowing families to remain until income reaches 150 percent of poverty (\$7.47 per hour for a family to two) makes sense as a first step in helping more Ohio families keep their jobs while also helping more children learn. Counties that have reduced welfare rolls should be permitted to keep part of the savings and help more working poor families through child care aid.

Because Ohio's child care computer system now provides accurate data, county-by-county enrollment can be closely monitored. New children could not be added into the child care computer system once enrollment ceilings are reached. Natural attrition will release placements for new children, thus avoiding

Providing
information on the
number of children
from working poor
families a county
can enroll is key to
local planning
efforts and
establishes
predictability in
the child care
system.



prolonged enrollment freezes. Ohio's successful Women, Infants and Children (WIC) nutrition program, which serves 250,000 mothers and children, provides a model that should be examined.

Under this approach, providers would have incentives to quickly identify families who are no longer using their services in order to release space for new enrollment. By contrast, prolonged closing of enrollment while, at the same time, not allowing replacements as children leave, undermines the stability of child care programs and family day care homes serving substantial numbers of families receiving child care aid. In addition, new providers are discouraged from serving poor children.

RECOMMENDATION #11

Help local planning efforts and establish predictability in child care aid for working poor families by identifying an enrollment ceiling for each county. Managing Child Care Funding

RECOMMENDATION #12

Permit counties with reduced welfare rolls to keep part of the savings and help more working poor families through child care aid.

RECOMMENDATION #13

Establish a pilot program in volunteer counties to develop waiting lists for child care help.

Ohio should also examine the use of waiting lists for child care help. Unlike 35 other states. Ohio has not established waiting lists for child care help; therefore no data is available at the state level about number of working poor families who would use child care help, if available. Through a pilot with volunteer counties, waiting lists could be established for eligible families once the maximum number of children are enrolled. A waiting list would allow counties to prioritize, enrolling families who become ineligible for guaranteed child care help first, followed by the lowest income families.

Waiting lists provide communities with a much better picture of the need for child care help. Identifying local need can foster creative public-private partnerships to expand services. Business and community leaders can play a key role when accurate information is available.

HELP WANTED

Legislative child care champions needed. Ohio needs a child care assistance program to make welfare reform work, to help families keep working, and to improve educational achievement. Poor children and families need bi-partisan legislative champions in each house. For information, call the Children's Defense Fund-Ohio at 614.221.2244.

HELP WANTED

Local child care champions needed. Ohio needs a child care assistance program to make welfare reform work, to help families keep working, and to improve educational achievement. Children and families need local advocates. For information, call the Children's Defense Fund-Ohio at 614.221.2244.



29

GLOSSARY

OF EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION TERMS

All early childhood programs provide both care and education for young children. The term and programs listed here and used in this report have evolved over time to distinguish among the funding sources, eligible populations, special focus, or primary reason for existence. The following terms provide a general description as used in Ohio.

Child Care

A program or service that provides care for children so parents can work, attend education or training programs, or engage in other activities. A few of Ohio's child care services are focused primarily on meeting the needs of children regardless of the parents' work or training status such as Protective, Special Needs, and Homeless Child Care.

Child Care Center

A facility and program licensed by the Ohio Department of Human Services (ODHS) to provide child care. Full-day programs generally operate at least 10 hours per day, five days a week. Part-day programs operating up to four hours a day are also licensed by ODHS. The facility and program must meet health and safety standards, minimum staff and administrator qualifications, and adult to child ratios.

Licensed Large Home (Type A) The residence of the provider where child care occurs for up to 12 children and is licensed by ODHS. The facility and program must meet health and safety standards, minimum staff and administrator qualifications, and adult to child ratios.

Family Day Care Home (Type B)

The residence of the provider where child care occurs for not more than six children.

Certified Family Day Care Home

A family day care home that meets health and safety standards and minimum provider qualifications. Homes are certified and inspected by county departments of human services in order to receive payment for families receiving child care aid.

JOBS or LEAP Child Care*

Under the Family Support Act of 1988 (now repealed), child care provided for families who depended on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (ADC) and participated in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program, or were employed and ADC teen parents who participated in the Learning, Earning, and Parenting Program.

Transitional Child Care*

Under the Family Support Act of 1988 (now repealed), child care provided for former ADC families for one year after leaving ADC to work.

At-Risk Child Care*

Small federal program (now repealed), child care assistance provided for working families at-risk of dependence on ADC if child care help is not available.



30

Child Care and Development Block Grant or Child Care Block Grant Federal child care grant to states that as of October 1996 consolidates all federal child care funding. Seventy percent of the funds must be used for families receiving welfare, those moving off welfare, and families at risk of welfare dependence without child care aid. Requires states to use a substantial portion of the remaining funds to serve low-income working families. Requires states to set aside a minimum of four percent to improve quality, expand supply, and provide consumer education. Limits administrative costs to five percent.

Child Care
Assistance for Working Poor Families

Child care aid for low-income working families, includes some families in education or training programs. Also referred to as the Non-Guaranteed Child Care Program.

Protective, Special Needs and Homeless Child Care Child care services provided based on the special circumstances of the child.

Licensed Preschool Programs

Refers to early childhood programs subject to licensure by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). Programs must meet health and safety standards, director and staff qualifications that exceed ODHS licensing requirements, and staff to child ratios. ODE licensed preschool programs can be full- or part-day.

Public School Preschool Preschool programs funded by ODE. Must provide developmentally appropriate programs and meet Head Start standards for comprehensive services.

Preschool Special Education

Preschool teacher and related services personnel who provide special education services for children ages three, four and five funded by ODE.

Before and After School Programs Child care programs serving children in kindergarten and above. Programs, which are also referred to as *Schoolage Child Care*, may be licensed by ODHS or ODE.

Kindergarten

The first required program provided by schools. Children must be five years of age by September 30 to be eligible to enroll in kindergarten.

Head Start

Federal and in Ohio state funded preschool program for poor children ages three and four. Ninety percent of enrolled families must be at or below the federal poverty guidelines, and ten percent of enrollment is reserved for children with disabilities. Programs are either licensed by ODHS or ODE. In addition, Head Start standards require health, nutrition, dental, mental health, education, social services, and parent involvement, including parent training and participation in management of the program. The majority of programs are part-day and provide bus transportation for children.



^{*} These federal programs have been consolidated into the Child Care and Development Block Grant. Aid to Families with Dependent Children has been replaced by Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). At the time this report went to press, Ohio had not officially changed the names of these programs.

STAFF TO CHILD RATIOS IN OHIO EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

.*.

Type B Home	No more	than 3 children	under age 2	1:6	1:6	1:6	1:6	1:6	Maximum of 6 children
ODHS Licersed Type A Home	1:4	1:4	1:6	1:6	1:6	1:6	1:6	1:6	Maximum of Ma 12 children
Lice Kindergarten		A.				1:25 Kindergarten	Students		Max 12
						1 Kinde	Stuc		
Head Start					2:17	2:17			
Public Preschool					2:17	2:17		学生被决 然	
Preschool Special Education					1:6 or 2:8	1:6 or 2:8			
ODE Licensed Centers	1:5 or 2:12	1:6	1:7	1:8	1:12 (2:24)	1:14 (2:28)			
ODHS Licensed Centers	1:5 or 2:12	1:6	1:7	1:8	1:12 (2:24)	1:14 (2:28)	1:18	1:20	
Age	Birth to 12 months	12 to 18 months	18 to 30 months	30 months to 3 years	3 to 4 years	4 to 5 years	5 to 11 years	11 to 15 years	

Chart reads: 1:5 means one adult staff member for five children.

29

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE September 1996

Aid to Families with Dependent Children JOBS, LEAP, Working Porther Adults Percent Children Percent								Child Care	Child Care Assistance		
Adults Percent Children Percent Children Percent Percent Children Percent Percent Children Percent Children Percent Percent Children Percent Children <th>Ohio</th> <th>Aid to Fa</th> <th>milies with</th> <th>Dependent</th> <th>Children</th> <th>JOBS,</th> <th>LEAP,</th> <th>Workin</th> <th>ng Poor</th> <th>All Chi</th> <th>All Child Care</th>	Ohio	Aid to Fa	milies with	Dependent	Children	JOBS,	LEAP,	Workin	ng Poor	All Chi	All Child Care
Adults Percent Children Percent Children Percent Children Percent Children Percent Children Percent Children Of State Served of State Of State Served of State Served of State Of State<						Transi	tional	and C	Other	Prog	Programs
ide 164,840 100.0% 376,215 100.0% 28,538 100.0% 30,784 11 1 1 1,206 0.41% 1,348 0.36% 53 0.19% 62 (9.1 1,206 0.73% 3,428 0.91% 73 0.26% 93 (9.1 1,206 0.73% 2,270 0.16% 233 0.88% 421 0.103% 1,231 0.75% 2,270 0.60% 233 0.82% 421 0.15% 1,231 0.75% 2,270 0.60% 233 0.82% 421 0.15% 1,311 0.75% 2,270 0.60% 233 0.82% 421 0.15% 0.13% 0.13% 0.15% 0.10% 0.15% 0.15% 0.10% 0.15% 0.10% 0.15% 0.10% 0.15% 0.10% 0.15% 0.10% 0.15% 0.10% 0.15% 0.10% 0.15% 0.10% 0.1		Adults	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent of
ide 164,840 100.0% 376,215 100.0% 28,538 100.0% 30,784 110 1		Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	State
s; 682 0.41% 1,348 0.36% 53 0.19% 62 0 ud 1,206 0.73% 3,428 0.91% 153 0.54% 130 ud 264 0.16% 590 0.16% 73 0.26% 93 0 s* 1,206 0.73% 3,603 0.96% 252 0.88% 421 s* 1,771 1.07% 3,603 0.96% 252 0.88% 421 s* 1,771 1.07% 3,603 0.96% 252 0.88% 421 se 210 0.13% 440 0.12% 128 0.45% 97 nt 1,811 1.10% 2,850 0.76% 63 0.22% 75 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 in 343 0.21% 6448 0.17% 38 0.13% 75 ont 2,506 1.52%	Statewide	164,840	100.0%	376,215	100.0%	28,538	100.0%	30,784	100.0%	59,322	100.0%
1,206 0.73% 3,428 0.91% 153 0.54% 130 0.104 264 0.16% 590 0.16% 73 0.26% 93 0.26% 254 0.16% 252 0.88% 421 264 0.15% 2,270 0.60% 233 0.82% 185 0.26 210 0.13% 2,850 0.76% 128 0.06% 57 0.26 255 0.25% 255 0.25% 255 0.26% 255 0.25% 255 255 0.25% 255	Adams	682	0.41%	1,348	0.36%	53	0.19%	62	0.20%	115	0.19%
id 264 0.16% 590 0.16% 73 0.26% 93 0 wulla* 1,771 1.07% 3,603 0.96% 252 0.88% 421 s** 1,771 1.07% 3,603 0.96% 252 0.88% 421 s** 1,771 1.07% 2,270 0.66% 233 0.82% 421 i* 1,031 0.13% 440 0.12% 16 0.06% 57 i* 471 0.29% 440 0.12% 63 0.45% 97 i* 471 0.29% 440 0.12% 63 0.45% 97 i* 471 0.29% 6,480 1.72% 223 0.78% 379 i* 343 0.21% 6,480 0.17% 253 0.78% 367 ont 2,506 1.52% 6,480 0.12% 253 0.89% 367 ont 1,271 0.13%	Allen	1,206	0.73%	3,428	0.91%	153	0.54%	130	0.42%	283	0.48%
vula* 1,771 1.07% 3,603 0.96% 252 0.88% 421 s* 1,771 1.07% 3,603 0.96% 253 0.82% 421 s* 1,231 0.75% 2,270 0.60% 233 0.82% 421 ze 210 0.13% 440 0.12% 16 0.06% 57 nt 1,811 1.10% 2,850 0.76% 128 0.45% 97 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 sign* 2,591 1.57% 6,480 0.17% 38 0.13% 367 ont 212 0.13% 469 0.12% 57 0.20% 499 ont 1,271 0.17% 2,691 0.72% 258 0.90% 499 oth 442 0.27% 856	Ashland	264	0.16%	590	0.16%	73	0.26%	93	0.30%	166	0.28%
5** 1,231 0.75% 2,270 0.60% 233 0.82% 185 0 zee 210 0.13% 440 0.12% 16 0.06% 57 0 nt 1,811 1.10% 2,850 0.76% 128 0.45% 97 0 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 0 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 0 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 0 1 343 0.21% 6,480 1.72% 223 0.78% 379 1 343 0.21% 640 0.12% 57 0.20% 109 ont 1,271 0.13% 469 0.12% 258 0.90% 499 oth 1,700 1.03% 3,262 0.87% 10.4% 95 ord <td>Ashtabula*</td> <td>1,771</td> <td>1.07%</td> <td>3,603</td> <td>%96.0</td> <td>252</td> <td>0.88%</td> <td>421</td> <td>1.37%</td> <td>673</td> <td>1.13%</td>	Ashtabula*	1,771	1.07%	3,603	%96.0	252	0.88%	421	1.37%	673	1.13%
ze 210 0.13% 440 0.12% 16 0.06% 57 int 1,811 1.10% 2,850 0.76% 128 0.45% 97 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 1 343 0.21% 640 0.17% 38 0.13% 10 asign* 212 0.13% 469 0.12% 57 0.20% 109 ont 1,271 0.71% 2,418 1.44% 253 0.90% 499 ont 1,271 0.77% 2,691 0.72% 258 0.90% 499 biana 1,700 1.03% 3,262 0.87% 97 0.34% 185 cton 442 0.27% 0.23% 0.45% 156 ord 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 0.27% <	Athens*	1,231	0.75%	2,270	%09.0	233	0.82%	185	0.60%	418	0.70%
nt 1,811 1.10% 2,850 0.76% 128 0.45% 97 * 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 1 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 1 471 0.29% 6,480 1.72% 223 0.78% 379 1 343 0.21% 640 0.17% 38 0.13% 10 asign* 212 0.13% 469 0.12% 57 0.20% 109 ont 1,271 0.77% 2,691 0.72% 253 0.89% 367 n* 287 0.17% 670 0.18% 41 0.14% 95 cton 442 0.27% 3,562 0.87% 670 0.45% 158 ord 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 0.27% 0.45% 158	Auglaize	210	0.13%	440	0.12%	16	0.06%	57	0.19%	73	0.12%
* 471 0.29% 977 0.26% 63 0.22% 75 1 2,591 1.57% 6,480 1.72% 223 0.78% 379 1 343 0.21% 6,480 1.72% 223 0.78% 379 1 343 0.21% 640 0.17% 38 0.13% 109 asign* 212 0.13% 469 0.12% 57 0.20% 109 ont 1,271 0.77% 2,691 0.72% 258 0.90% 499 n* 287 0.17% 670 0.18% 41 0.14% 95 cton 442 0.27% 856 0.23% 97 0.45% 158 ord 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 0.27% 1.57% 1.58	Belmont	1,811	1.10%	2,850	0.76%	128	0.45%	97	0.32%	225	0.38%
1 2,591 1.57% 6,480 1.72% 223 0.78% 379 1 343 0.21% 640 0.17% 38 0.13% 10 naign* 212 0.13% 469 0.12% 57 0.20% 109 ont 1,271 0.13% 5,418 1.44% 253 0.89% 367 n* 2,506 1.52% 5,418 1.44% 253 0.90% 499 n* 287 0.17% 670 0.18% 41 0.14% 95 biana 1,700 1.03% 3,262 0.87% 305 1.07% 512 cton 442 0.27% 856 0.23% 97 0.45% 185 ord 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 0.27% 1.27 0.45% 1.55	Brown*	471	0.29%	776	0.26%	63	0.22%	75	0.24%	138	0.23%
1 343 0.21% 640 0.17% 38 0.13% 10 asign* 212 0.13% 469 0.12% 57 0.20% 109 ont 1,271 0.77% 2,691 0.72% 258 0.90% 499 n* 287 0.17% 670 0.18% 41 0.14% 95 cton 442 0.27% 856 0.23% 97 0.45% 185 ord 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 1,001 0.27% 1,52	Butler	2,591	1.57%	6,480	1.72%	223	0.78%	379	1.23%	602	1.01%
saign* 212 0.13% 469 0.12% 57 0.20% 109 ont 2,506 1.52% 5,418 1.44% 253 0.89% 367 ont 1,271 0.77% 2,691 0.72% 258 0.90% 499 n* 287 0.17% 670 0.18% 41 0.14% 95 cton 442 0.27% 856 0.23% 97 0.34% 185 ord 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 1.07% 1.58 1.66	Carroll	343	0.21%	640	0.17%	38	0.13%	10	0.03%	48	%80.0
ont 2,506 1.52% 5,418 1.44% 253 0.89% 367 ont 1,271 0.77% 2,691 0.72% 258 0.90% 499 n* 287 0.17% 670 0.18% 41 0.14% 95 cton 442 0.27% 856 0.23% 97 0.34% 185 ord 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 250 1.27 0.45%	Champaign*	212	0.13%	469	0.12%	57	0.20%	109	0.35%	166	0.28%
ont 1,271 0.77% 2,691 0.72% 258 0.90% 499 n* 287 0.17% 670 0.18% 41 0.14% 95 rbiana 1,700 1.03% 3,262 0.87% 305 1.07% 512 cton 442 0.27% 856 0.23% 97 0.34% 185 ord 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 127 0.45% 156	Clark	2,506	1.52%	5,418	1.44%	253	0.89%	367	1.19%	620	1.05%
1 1 <td>Clermont</td> <td>1,271</td> <td>0.77%</td> <td>2,691</td> <td>0.72%</td> <td>258</td> <td>0.60%</td> <td>499</td> <td>1.62%</td> <td>757</td> <td>1.28%</td>	Clermont	1,271	0.77%	2,691	0.72%	258	0.60%	499	1.62%	757	1.28%
1a 1,700 1.03% 3,262 0.87% 305 1.07% 512 1 442 0.27% 856 0.23% 97 0.34% 185 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 127 0.45% 158	Clinton*	287	0.17%	0/9	0.18%	41	0.14%	95	0.31%	136	0.23%
442 0.27% 856 0.23% 97 0.34% 185 488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 127 0.45% 158	Columbiana	1,700	1.03%	3,262	0.87%	305	1.07%	512	1.66%	817	1.38%
488 0.30% 1,001 0.27% 127 0.45% 158	Coshocton	442	0.27%	856	0.23%	16	0.34%	185	0.60%	282	0.48%
7017 11740/	Crawford	488	0.30%	1,001	0.27%	127	0.45%	158	0.51%	285	0.48%
34,6/9 21.04% 81,064 21.55% 5,064 17.74% 4,195	Cuyahoga	34,679	21.04%	81,064	21.55%	5,064	17.74%	4,195	13.63%	9,259	15.61%

Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, 1997

AID TO DEPENDENT CHII DREN AND CHII D'ABE ACCICTANCE

AID IO DEPENDEN! CHILDREN AND CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE, September 1996 (continued)	FNUEN	CHILD	ZEN AN	D CHILD	CARE	NSSIS I A	NCE, Se	ptembe	r 1996 (c	ontinued)
							Child Care	Child Care Assistance		
Ohio	Aid to Fa	Aid to Families with	h Dependent Children	Children	JOBS, LEAP	LEAP,	Working Poor	ig Poor	All Chi	All Child Care
					Transitional	itional	and (and Other	Prog	Programs
	Adults	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent
	Served	pf State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State
Darke*	212	0.13%	478	0.13%	29	0.10%	118	0.38%	147	0.25%
Defiance	280	0.17%	613	0.16%	42	0.15%	113	0.37%	155	0.26%
Delaware*	397	0.24%	865	0.23%	44	0.15%	153	0.50%	197	0.33%
Erie*	704	0.43%	1,797	0.48%	265	0.93%	430	1.40%	695	1.17%
Fairfield*	777	0.47%	1,552	0.41%	165	0.58%	225	0.73%	390	299 .0
Fayette	295	0.18%	674	0.18%	50	0.18%	41	0.13%	91	0.15%
Franklin*	14,280	8.66%	37,881	10.07%	3,794	13.29%	4,039	13.12%	7,833	13.20%
Fulton	137	0.08%	303	0.08%	34	0.12%	84	0.27%	118	0.20%
Gallia	973	0.59%	1,763	0.47%	86	0.30%	31	0.10%	117	0.20%
Geauga	212	0.13%	460	0.12%	106	0.37%	147	0.48%	253	0.43%
Greene*	1,113	0.68%	2,329	0.62%	283	0.99%	346	1.12%	629	1.06%
Guernsey*	732	0.44%	1,502	0.40%	157	0.55%	202	0.66%	359	0.61%
Hamilton	13,323	8.08%	34,549	9.18%	4,244	14.87%	3,783	12.29%	8,027	13.53%
Hancock*	405	0.25%	892	0.24%	100	0.35%	171	0.56%	271	0.46%
Hardin	314	0.19%	575	0.15%	51	0.18%	47	0.15%	98	0.17%
Harrison	344	0.21%	260	0.15%	39	0.14%	24	0.08%	63	0.11%
Henry	136	0.08%	295	0.08%	8	0.03%	75	0.24%	83	0.14%
Highland	431	0.26%	940	0.25%	42	0.15%	99	0.21%	108	0.18%
Hocking	379	0.23%	779	0.21%	41	0.14%	63	0.20%	104	0.18%
Holmes	118	0.07%	228	0.06%	16	0.06%	58	0.19%	74	0.12%
Huron	558	0.34%	1,261	0.34%	157	0.55%	199	0.65%	356	0.60%
Huron	558	0.34%	1,261	0.34%	157	0	55%		199	199 0.65%

31

Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, 1997

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE, September 1996 (continued)

							Child Care	Child Care Assistance		
Ohio	Aid to Fa	Aid to Families with	h Dependent Children	Children	JOBS, LEAP	LEAP,	Working Poor	g Poor	All Chi	All Child Care
			•		Transitional	tional	and (and Other	Prog	Programs
	Adults	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent of
	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	State
Jackson*	<i>L</i> 99	0.40%	1,363	0.36%	107	0.37%	120	0.39%	227	0.38%
lefferson	2.020	1.23%	3,484	0.93%	207	0.73%	213	0.69%	420	0.71%
Knox	379	0.23%	829	0.22%	82	0.29%	163	0.53%	245	0.41%
Lake*	1.113	0.68%	2,290	0.61%	220	0.77%	286	0.93%	909	0.85%
Lawrence*	2,015	1.22%	3,972	1.06%	222	0.78%	240	0.78%	462	0.78%
Licking*	1,350	0.82%	2,774	0.74%	328	1.15%	279	0.91%	209	1.02%
Logan	511	0.31%	1,051	0.28%	64	0.22%	36	0.12%	100	0.17%
Lorain*	3,942	2.39%	9,244	2.46%	631	2.21%	647	2.10%	1,278	2.15%
Lucas*	10,748	6.52%	24,708	6.57%	829	2.90%	718	2.33%	1,547	2.61%
Madison	276	0.17%	574	0.15%	45	0.16%	71	0.23%	116	0.20%
Mahoning	5,771	3.50%	13,357	3.55%	764	2.68%	632	2.05%	1,396	2.35%
Marion*	674	0.41%	1,728	0.46%	118	0.41%	276	0.90%	394	%99.0
Medina	649	0.39%	1,281	0.34%	127	0.45%	212	%69.0	339	0.57%
Meigs	832	0.50%	1,398	0.37%	100	0.35%	79	0.26%	179	0.30%
Mercer	173	0.11%	360	0.10%	36	0.13%	54	0.18%	8	0.15%
Miami*	528	0.32%	1,189	0.32%	99	0.20%	137	0.45%	193	0.33%
Monroe	307	0.19%	490	0.13%	2	0.01%	0	0.00%	2	0.00%
Montgomery*	8,017	4.86%	20,803	5.53%	1,614	999.5	1,971	6.40%	3,585	6.04%
Morgan	278	0.17%	575	0.15%	52	0.18%	35	0.11%	87	0.15%
Morrow	329	0.20%	889	0.18%	40	0.14%	107	0.35%	147	0.25%
Muskingum	1,391	0.84%	2,926	0.78%	300	1.05%	435	1.41%	735	1.24%
0						j				

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE, September 1996 (continued)

							Child Care	Child Care Assistance		
Ohio	Aid to Fa	milies with	Aid to Families with Dependent Children	Children	JOBS,	JOBS, LEAP,	Working Pool	ng Poor	All Chi	All Child Care
					Transitional	itional) pue	and Other	Prog	Programs
	Adults	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent of
	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	State
Noble	194	0.12%	323	%60.0	0	%00.0	8	0.03%	8	0.01%
Ottawa	251	0.15%	480	0.13%	51	0.18%	36	0.12%	87	0.15%
Paulding	146	0.09%	279	0.07%	6	0.03%	20	0.06%	29	0.05%
Perry*	755	0.46%	1,498	0.40%	78	0.27%	122	0.40%	200	0.34%
Pickaway	495	0.30%	1,112	0.30%	92	0.32%	107	0.35%	199	0.34%
Pike	703	0.43%	1,541	0.41%	41	0.14%	32	0.10%	73	0.12%
Portage*	1,245	0.76%	2,481	%99.0	223	0.78%	354	1.15%	577	0.97%
Preble	235	0.14%	537	0.14%	44	0.15%	89	0.22%	112	0.19%
Putnam	204	0.12%	405	0.11%	23	0.08%	99	0.18%	79	0.13%
Richland*	1,711	1.04%	3,771	1.00%	441	1.55%	452	1.47%	893	1.51%
Ross	1,229	0.75%	2,449	0.65%	112	0.39%	113	0.37%	225	0.38%
Sandusky	973	0.59%	1,975	0.53%	74	0.26%	138	0.45%	212	0.36%
Scioto	2,758	1.67%	5,379	1.43%	369	1.29%	280	0.91%	649	1.09%
Seneca	464	0.28%	1,065	0.28%	16	0.32%	134	0.44%	225	0.38%
Shelby	367	0.22%	812	0.22%	9/	0.27%	148	0.48%	224	0.38%
Stark	5,383	3.27%	11,512	3.06%	750	2.63%	801	2.60%	1,551	2.61%
Summit*	9,673	5.87%	20,847	5.54%	1,258	4.41%	1,047	3.40%	2,305	3.89%
Trumbull	3,729	2.26%	7,730	2.05%	795	2.79%	692	2.50%	1,564	2.64%
Tuscarawas*	724	0.44%	1,548	0.41%	181	0.63%	298	0.97%	479	0.81%
Union	191	0.10%	352	0.09%	69	0.24%	109	0.35%	178	0.30%

Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, 1997

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE, September 1996 (continued)

							Child Care	Child Care Assistance		
Ohio	Aid to Fa	Aid to Families with	Dependent Children	Children	JOBS, LEAP	LEAP,	Working Poor	ng Poor	All Chi	All Child Care
			·		Transitional	tional	and C	and Other	Prog	Programs
	Adults	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent	Children	Percent of
	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	of State	Served	State
Van Wert	6	0.05%	236	%90'0	22	%80'0	36	0.12%	58	0.10%
Vinton*	332	0.20%	644	0.17%	33	0.12%	53	0.17%	98	0.14%
Warren*	503	0.31%	1,147	0.30%	212	0.74%	306	%66.0	518	0.87%
Washinoton	721	0.44%		0.39%	49	0.17%	41	0.13%	06	0.14%
Wavne	639	0.39%		0.36%	171	%09.0	296	%96.0	467	0.79%
Williams	224	0.14%		0.12%	48	0.17%	57	0.19%	105	0.18%
Wood	590	0.36%	1,217	0.32%	84	0.29%	128	0.42%	212	0.36%
Wvandot	98	0.05%	197	0.05%	=	0.04%	20	0.06%	31	0.05%

*As of December 13, 1996, 29 counties had closed enrollment to child care assistance for working poor families. The remaining 59 counties had a variety of income maximums for families to enter and/or leave the child care assistance program. These income maximums ranged from enrollment with income at 100 percent of poverty (\$4.98 per hour for a parent and one child) to 150 percent of poverty (\$7.47 per hour). Families became ineligible for child care aid with incomes ranging from 105 percent of poverty (\$5.22 per hour) to a high of 185 percent of poverty (\$9.21 per hour).

Percent of State for Aid to Families with Dependent Children calculations by CDF-Ohio.

ADC-Regular, ADC-Incapacitated. ADC-Unemployed adults. ADC was replaced by Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) on October 1, 1996. JOBS, LEAP, and Transitional Child Care includes funding codes: 312, 313, 314, 326, and 327. Working Poor and Other Child Care includes funding codes: 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326, 329, and 899 SOURCES: Ohio Department of Human Services, Report GRP342RA and Report NMR120RA. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (ADC) includes

NOTE: Child care data reflect services paid for in September 1996 and in some counties may not reflect the typical level of enrollment.

Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, 1997

34

SOURCES

Adams, G. & N. Oxendine Poersh, Who Cares? State Commitment to Child Care and Early Education, Children's Defense Fund, December 1996.

Carnegie Corporation of New York, Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children, April 1994.

Carnegie Corporation of New York, Years of Promise: A Comprehensive Learning Strategy for America's Children, September 1996.

Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers, University of Colorado at Denver, University of California at Los Angeles, University of North Carolina, Yale University, Public Report, April 1995.

Division of Early Childhood Education, Ohio Department of Education, A Longitudinal Research Study of: The Effects of Preschool Attendance & Kindergarten Schedule, Kindergarten Through Grade Four, 1992.

Galinsky, E., et al., The Study of Children in Family Child Care and Relative Care, Families and Work Institute, 1994.

Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, Valuing Families: The High Cost of Waiting for Child Care Slide Fee Assistance, 1995.

Jenkins, H.L., Testimony presented before the Ohio House of Representatives Child and Youth Committee, June 9, 1992.

Mishel, L., Bernstein, J., & J. Schmitt, *The State of Working America:* 1996-1997, Economic Policy Institute, 1996.

National Women's Law Center, Child Care Tax Credits Outreach Campaign Organizers' Information Packet, 1992 (and November 1994 update).

Ohio Child Care Resource and Referral Association, 1995 Report.

Ohio Department of Education, EMIS Pupil Data, Kindergarten Head Count, 1996, World Wide Web Server.



Ohio Department of Human Services, Aid to Dependent Children Demographic Report, December 1996.

Ohio Department of Human Services, Non-Guaranteed Child Care Eligibility Levels for SFY97, December 13, 1996.

Ohio Department of Human Services, Report NMR120RA, Child Care 3299 Statewide Utilization Analysis for Payment Period from 91/96 to 9/30/96.

Ohio Department of Human Services, Report SIWRO8P1, Day Care Statistics, September 20, 1996.

Poersch, N., Adams, G., & J. Sanfort, Child Care and Development: Key Facts, Children's Defense Fund, April 1994.

Public Law 104-193, Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, 104th Congress.

Real, M., Creating Futures for Ohio's Children, Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, 1991.

Real, M., et al., Helping Families Work: A 1995/1996 Factbook, Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, 1995.

Rhodes, G.L. & Real, M., Day Care: *Investing in Ohio's Children*, Children's Defense Fund-Ohio, 1985.

Rowland, D., "Ohio Ahead of the Curve in Federal Welfare Reform," *The Columbus Dispatch*, November 24, 1996.



About the Children's Defense Fund

The Children's Defense Fund (CDF) was founded in 1973 by Marian Wright Edelman to provide a strong and effective voice for the children of America who cannot vote, lobby, or speak for themselves. Our goal is to educate the nation about the needs of children and encourage preventive investment in children before they get sick, drop out of school, or get into trouble.

CDF is a unique organization because it focuses on programs and policies that affect large numbers of children, rather than on helping families on a case-by-base basis. CDF educates the public about the conditions of children and successful programs. We work to shape, federal, state, and local policies for children by identifying cost-effective remedies. We also reach out to families to inform them of ways to help themselves.

Our main office is in Washington, D.C. CDF-Ohio began its work in Columbus in 1981 and is the oldest CDF state office. Ohio leads the country in grassroots support for CDF's local work through its Greater Cincinnati and Greater Columbus projects. CDF also maintains offices in New York, Minnesota, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

CDF is a private, non-profit, nonpartisan research and advocacy organization supported by foundations, corporate grants, and individual donations. As an independent voice for children, CDF does not accept government funds.

Major support for CDF-Ohio in 1996-1997 came from foundations and companies, including:

Bank One Capital Corporation; Bank One, Columbus, N.A.; Borden, Inc.; The Annie E. Casey Foundation;

The Cleveland Foundation, Harry Coulby Fund No. 4;

Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.;

The Columbus Foundation, The James
Overstreet Fund and The Public Education
Fund:

Coopers and Lybrand; Emens, Kegler, Brown, Hill and Ritter;

Bob Evans Farms, Inc.;

Express, Inc.;
Ford Motor Company;

Dareth and Bernie Gerlach;

Glimcher Realty Trust;

The George Gund Foundation;

Ingram-White Castle Foundation:

The Joyce Foundation;

The Kroger Company;

The Limited, Inc.;

The Longaberger Company;

Morton and Barbara Mandel Family Foundation:

Mount Carmel Health System;

National City Bank;

Nationwide Insurance Enterprise Foundation;

The Nord Family Foundation;

Ohio Children's Foundation;

Pizzuti Family Foundation;

The Procter and Gamble Company;

Ross Products Division;

James A. and Kathy C. Rutherford Foundation;

Schottenstein / Value City Department Stores;

Squire, Sanders and Dempsey;

TRW Foundation:

Barbara Trueman;

Voyrs, Sater, Seymour and Pease;

WBNS-10TV KidsNews Network;

Abigail and Leslie Wexner, Philanthropic

Foundation; and,

Wolfe Enterprises, Inc.





Children's Defense Fund-Ohio

52 East Lynn Street, Suite 400 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3508 Phone: 614/221-2244 Fax: 614/221-2247

E-mail: CDFOHIO@infinet.com

Mark Real, Director & Legislative Counsel





U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDE	NTIFICATION:		· ·.
Title: Chied	Care: Children	Learning Far	nilus Carnina
Author(s): (Wui	Stone burner and	Mark Real	
Corporate Source:			Publication Date:
(hildren's	Wedense Fund- C	thio	1997
II. REPRODUCTIO	N RELEASE:		
in the monthly abstract journ paper copy, and electronic/ given to the source of each	as widely as possible timely and significant real of the ERIC system, <i>Resources in Educa</i> optical media, and sold through the ERIC Dodocument, and, if reproduction release is gra	tion (RIE), are usually made available ocument Reproduction Service (EDRS inted, one of the following notices is a	e to users in microfiche, reproduced b) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is affixed to the document.
If permission is granted the bottom of the page.	d to reproduce and disseminate the identified	document, please CHECK ONE of t	he following two options and sign at
	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below affixed to all Level 2 docume	
Check here	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PA COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED	APER 1
For Level 1 Release: Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4° x 6° film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) and paper copy.	TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOU	
	Level 1	Level 2	
Thereby grathis docume	cuments will be processed as indicated provide produce is granted, but neither box is check and to the Educational Resources Information Cont as indicated above. Reproduction from the tyees and its system contractors requires per to by libraries and other service agencies to sation	ed, documents will be processed at Least tender (ERIC) nonexclusive permission ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical mission from the copyright holder. Ex	to reproduce and disseminate media by persons other than ception is made for non-profit
Signature:	A 1	i Printed Name/Position/Title	
••• re→ ///A	h llal	Mark Panl	Disporto
Organization/Address Child Rev	's Defense Fund-Dhio Inn St., Suite 400	Telephone: (0/4- 221.2244	614-221,2247
ERIC 52 E. Ly Columbi		E-Mail Address:	Date: 3/17/97

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:		
COF-Ohio		
Address: 52 E. LYDA S+,	Suite 400	
Columbus, OH	Suite 400 43215- 3508	
Price:		
75 + postage		

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	:
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

KAREN E. SMITH
ERIC/EECE
CHILDREN'S RESEARCH CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
51 GERTY DRIVE
CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820-7469

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility 1100 West Street, 2d Floor Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

ev. 6/96)

